DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 430 937 SP 038 519

AUTHOR	Julian, Rae
TITLE	"If We Didn't Have Them, We'd Have To Reinvent Them." An Evaluation of Normal and Model Schools in New Zealand.
INSTITUTION	New Zealand Council for Educational Research, Wellington.
ISBN	ISBN-1-877140-25-2
PUB DATE	1997-00-00
NOTE	53p.
AVAILABLE FROM	NZCER Distribution Services, P.O. Box 3237, Wellington, New Zealand.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*College School Cooperation; Elementary Secondary Education; Field Experience Programs; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *Partnerships in Education; *Practicums; *Preservice Teacher Education; School Role; *Student Teaching
IDENTIFIERS	New Zealand; *Normal Schools

ABSTRACT

This report describes the evaluation of normal and model schools in New Zealand. Researchers examined the difference between the schools and the difference between them and other schools involved in preservice teacher education. The study used a mailed survey of the 22 normal and 8 model schools and telephone interviews with practicum coordinators from 5 colleges of education and 1 university school of education that worked closely with the normal and model schools. Researchers asked about how well the schools performed practicum responsibilities, the impact of the schools on teacher education in general, changes occurring in the teacher education environment and schools' responses, and the future capability of schools to respond to anticipated demands for teacher education. Results were taken to focus groups of principals in Wellington, Auckland, and Dunedin. Results indicated that the main differences between the normal and model schools and the other schools was that normal and model schools included the practicums as part of their core business. Many included the role in their charter statement. Normal and model schools had close partnerships with the colleges of education. Colleges of education considered normal and model schools essential to their programs. Normal and models schools did not cover the full range of socioeconomic status, and trainees did not have the chance to work with more diverse students. Two appendixes present the study questionnaires. (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 430 937

"If We Didn't Have Them, We'd Have To Reinvent Them"

AN EVALUATION OF NORMAL AND MODEL SCHOOLS IN NEW ZEALAND

Rae Julian

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. Webber

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

New Zealand Council for Educational Research
Wellington
1997

SP038SA

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"If We Didn't Have Them, We'd Have To Reinvent Them"

AN EVALUATION OF NORMAL AND MODEL SCHOOLS IN NEW ZEALAND

Rae Julian

New Zealand Council for Educational Research
Wellington
1997

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

New Zealand Council for Educational Research
P O Box 3237
Wellington
New Zealand

© NZCER, 1997

ISBN 1–877140–25–2

Distributed by
NZCER Distribution Services
P O Box 3237, Wellington
New Zealand

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study could not have been carried out without the co-operation of the principals of normal and model schools, especially those on the executive of the Normal School Principals' Association. Thanks are also due to Dr Cathy Wylie for review of the questionnaires and the draft, to Fay Swann for editing, and to Roberta Tiatia and Carlene Grigg for formatting.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The evaluation of normal and model schools covered in this report was carried out by the New Zealand Council for Educational Research (NZCER) at the request of the New Zealand Normal School Principals' Association during August-September 1997. The Association commissioned:

- an independent resource to support any submissions by the association to counter moves to reduce the current role of normal and model schools;
- an accurate view of the scope of the activities undertaken by normal and model schools, to be used by individual schools and the association in any discussions or negotiations with providers of teacher education;
- some indicators for future development and direction for normal and model schools to position themselves to take advantage of the changing teacher environment.

Methodology

A postal survey of the 22 normal and the 8 model schools was carried out. Telephone interviews were conducted with the practicum co-ordinators from the 5 colleges of education (COEs) and 1 university school of education which have worked closely with the normal and model schools since the designation of the schools. The results were taken to focus groups of all of the principals in Wellington, Auckland, and Dunedin.

Results

It appeared from the research that the main differences between the normal and model schools, and the other schools which provide practicums, is that normal and model schools include the practicums as part of their core business. Many include the role in their charter statements. All aspects of their work, from the recruitment of teachers, the planning of programmes, and even their extracurricular activities, are based on the assumption that trainees are a key part of the system. The COEs place a great deal of confidence in the schools, using them for the majority of their placements, as well as for any special training needs, such as micro-teaching or demonstration teaching.

The comments of both the schools and the COE co-ordinators show the close partnership that exists between most of the schools and the COEs in order to bring about the most effective training for the trainees. There is frequent, almost daily, liaison between the lecturers and the associate teachers which leads to early identification of potential problems, and joint measures to overcome the problems. Many of the associate teachers and senior staff are on COE committees, and it is clear that the staff at the normal and model schools can function as comfortably in an adult education environment as they can with school students.

The COEs all agreed that they considered the schools to be an essential part of their programmes. As one co-ordinator said "If we had to do without them, we would have to reinstate them".

The only major disadvantage of the normal and model schools was that they did not cover the full SES decile range, and that trainees did not get adequate opportunities to work with Maori students at normal and model schools. One COE overcame the problem by designating an additional normal school in its catchment area. Given the pressure on the current normal and model schools this would appear to be a useful way of alleviating the problem. It would work to the benefit of both the newly designated school through its corresponding increase in status and additional funding, and would assist the COE to place trainees in a full range of normal schools.

Economic Factors

It seems clear that the normal and model schools meet most of the requirements for an effective practicum within their individual schools. The COEs state that they know they can rely on these schools for consistent best practice. They can find some of the elements they require in other schools, but the skills are scattered among individual teachers. If there were no normal and model schools, no schools would be legally obligated to take trainees and the COEs would have to negotiate individual services from a wide range of schools, thereby incurring considerably higher costs than those covered by current allowances and salaries to the normal and model schools.

If the normal and model schools were to lose their designation, they would also lose their special status. They may find it harder to attract quality teachers and the COEs would no longer have readily accessible, high-standard schools for their practicums. Again, higher costs would be incurred.

Conclusions

From both an educational and an economic perspective, it can be seen that the normal and model schools serve a valuable and essential function. Given the proliferation of providers, it appears that more such schools, rather than fewer, are necessary. However, it is also important that the high standards achieved by the current schools are required of the new ones. Although it is important that teacher trainees see a variety of standards of teaching and must include difficult schools among their practicum experience, they must have examples of excellence against which they can measure other schools in order to develop their own personal teaching values. Reflective teachers must have a sound basis for their judgments. Their "learning journeys" must give them ample opportunities for such reflection.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS iii

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY iv
- Methodology iv
- Results iv
- Economic Factors v
- Conclusions v

CONTENTS vii

NORMAL AND MODEL SCHOOLS IN NEW ZEALAND: AN EVALUATION 1
- Introduction 1
- Background 1
- Theoretical Context 2
- Methodology 3

DESCRIPTION OF THE SCHOOLS 4
- Number of Students 4
- Socioeconomic Status of schools 4
- Ethnicity of Students 5
- Qualifications of Teachers 5
- Professional Development 6
- Special Facilities Provided Due to Designation 6
- Special Funding Granted to the School To Recompense the Costs of Providing Teacher Education 7

THE ROLE OF THE NORMAL AND MODEL SCHOOLS IN PRE-SERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION 8
- Numbers of Trainees 8
- Time Spent Specifically with Trainees 8
- Briefing for Trainee Teachers 9
- Feedback to Trainee Teachers on Their Practicum 9
- Training for Associate Teachers 9
- Activities Conducted as Part of the Practicums During Terms 1 and 2 of 1997 9

RELATIONSHIPS WITH THE COLLEGES OF EDUCATION 11
- Membership of College of Education Committees 11
- Teaching Staff as Lecturers at the Colleges of Education 11
- Meetings 11
- Special Training and Feedback Provided by Colleges of Education 12
- Preparation of Trainee Teachers by the College of Education for the Practicum 12

THE GOALS OF THE PRACTICUM 13
- Co-ordinators' Expectations of Schools and What the Normal and Model Schools Do To Assist Trainees To Reach the Goals 13

Classroom Management 14
Pedagogy 14
Curriculum Coverage 15
Assessment 15
Teaching Specific Groups of Students 15
Communication with Parents 16
School Governance 16
Differences in the Way that Normal and Model Schools Assist Trainee Teachers To Reach These Goals, Compared with Other Schools in the Region 17
Pedagogy 17
Classroom Management 17
Curriculum Coverage 17
Assessment 17
Teaching Specific Groups of Students 17
Communication with Parents 18
School Governance 18
Other Differences between Practicums Provided by the Normal and Model Schools and Those at the Other Schools (from Co-ordinators) 18
Facilities 18
Specific Activities 18
Supervision and Assessment of the Trainee Teachers 18

THE ADVANTAGES OF PLACING TRAINEES IN PRACTICUMS AT THE NORMAL AND MODEL SCHOOLS 19
The Co-ordinators' Views 19
The Views of the Normal and Model Schools 19
The Flow-on Effects from Involvement with the Practicums 20
Schools 20
Students 20
Teachers 20
Evidence of Positive Outcomes from Involvement in Trainee Teacher Education 21
Trainee Teacher Satisfaction 21
College of Education Satisfaction 21
Relevant Material from the Most Recent Education Review Office Report 21

DISADVANTAGES ARISING FROM DESIGNATION AS NORMAL OR MODEL SCHOOLS 23
Co-ordinators 23
Specific Problems for the Schools Arising from the Provision of Practicums 23

CHANGES IN THE TEACHER EDUCATION ENVIRONMENT: CURRENT AND IN THE FUTURE 25

FINAL COMMENTS 26

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS 27
Differences between Normal and Model Schools 28
Economic Factors 29
Conclusions 29

REFERENCES 30

APPENDIX 1 31
Questionnaire for Schools 32

APPENDIX 2 41
Questionnaire for College of Education Practicum Co-ordinators 41

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1 Number of Students 4
2 SES Decile of Normal and Model Schools 5
3 Ethnicity of Students: Incidence of Schools 5
4 Qualifications of Teachers 6
5 Patterns of Use for Terms 1–2, 1997 8
6 Goals of the Practicum 13
7 Advantages of Designation as Normal or Model School 19

NORMAL AND MODEL SCHOOLS IN NEW ZEALAND: AN EVALUATION

Introduction

The evaluation of normal and model schools covered in this report was carried out in order to provide an accurate and current picture of the role played by normal and model schools in teacher education in New Zealand.

The research questions addressed in the report are:

- How are normal and model schools different from each other?
- How are normal and model schools different from other primary schools which are involved in teacher education?
- How well do normal and model schools perform their practicum responsibilities?
- What is the impact of normal and model schools on teacher education in general?
- What significant changes are occurring in the teacher education environment?
- How well are normal and model schools responding to this changing environment?
- What is the future capability of normal and model schools to respond to anticipated demands for teacher education?

Background

The term "normal schools" derived from the French "écoles normales", which was used to describe a group of schools in sixteenth-century France. These schools were designated to become teacher training schools but, in order to emphasise that they were also schools in which children were taught, they were called "écoles normales". The term was later adopted in other parts of the world to describe schools in which teaching practicums are carried out.

The first normal school in New Zealand was established in Dunedin in 1876. Part of the school was a teacher training department, which was the only source of teacher education in the region until the transfer of the department which was housed in a separate building as Dunedin Teachers' College in 1909. From that time other normal schools were designated to provide practicums, at around the same time as the establishment of teachers' training colleges in Auckland, Wellington, and Christchurch, and later when colleges were established in Palmerston North and Hamilton. Although 2 colleges were closed in Auckland, the normal schools in that area retained their designation. There are currently 22 normal schools, 5 of which have also model school components.

Model schools were established later than the normal schools. They were set up after World War II in centres which had teachers' training colleges. At first, they were self-sufficient autonomous institutions, attached to a host school in order to provide an opportunity for trainee teachers to observe multiclass teaching situations similar to those in the rural schools where many of the trainees would later find themselves teaching. Later, some small rural schools were designated as model schools. There are currently 8 full model schools and a number of normal schools with model school components.

Section 148 of the Education Act 1989 confirms the special status of the normal and model schools, stating that they may be designated as such for a specified college of education.

The Ministry of Education's Ministerial Reference Group (1995) reported on resource entitlement for sc' ool staffing. They included a brief section on the normal and model schools, which included the view that:

> . . . not all schools currently designated as normal or country model are able to play a full part in primary teacher education.

No reasons were given for the statement. The Group went on to recommend:

> Subject to the requirements for consultation in the Education Act, . . . the present normal and country model school designations be removed as from 1996, and that a contract be let for a three-year period by the providers of primary teacher education for schools to tender to provide a service similar to that currently provided by normal schools.

No further action was taken on the recommendation, in the expectation that it would be taken into account as part of the review of teacher education to take place in 1997.

Helen Shaw (1997) reported to the Ministry of Education in June 1997 on the current arrangements between pre-service teacher training providers and schools including the normal schools. She carried out a comprehensive study of the normal schools, based on information from the schools, and from both the established and the newer providers of teacher education. There are many similarities in the findings from Shaw's study and the present one, especially in the roles of the normal schools and their relationships with the established providers. She concluded that:

> In a simple purchase model, the wider interests of schools could easily be subsumed to a more restricted provider focus on teaching practice. Further there would be no immediate incentive for providers to commit themselves to school improvement.

Theoretical Context

Research done on the practicum, especially that by Rosemary Dobbins (1996), suggests that the components of a successful practicum, that is, a practicum which is empowering for the trainee teachers, should:

- focus on the classroom, school, and community;
- take account of both intended and unintended learning outcomes that result from a practicum experience;
- provide times for action and reflection;
- allow for individual needs to be met;
- create opportunities for collaborative learning situations.

Dobbins also states that the practicum forms part of the trainee's total "learning journey". As such, the trainee must be able to place the practicum experience within a total framework of the school. This implies careful programming in order to cover the particular goals of the practicum, including teaching experience, balanced with opportunities to observe good practice, and also time to reflect on the learning acquired during the process.

Cruickshank (1990) reports on the work of Turney (1987), who noted that:

> . . . conflicts arise when one member of the student teaching triad (student teacher, cooperating teacher, and college superviser) is excluded, when there are different perceptions regarding their roles, when there is a lack of opportunity to carry out their roles, when there are conflicts that inhibit carrying out their roles, and when there are personality differences, poor communication, and differing views with regard to effective practice.

Methodology

A postal survey of the 22 normal and the 8 model schools was carried out. Telephone interviews were conducted with the practicum co-ordinators from the 5 colleges of education (COEs) and 1 university school of education.[1] These were the COEs which have worked closely with the normal and model schools since the designation of the schools. The results were taken to focus groups of all the principals in Wellington, Auckland, and Dunedin. All 30 schools were represented at the focus group meetings. Additional comments from the group meetings were added to the data from the postal surveys. Many of these comments arose from the principals' desire to include their schools in some of the comments made by other schools. They stated that they had not responded similarly to some of the open-ended questions because they had not thought of the particular response at the time they were completing the questionnaire.

Where appropriate, for example, when school size was a factor, results from normal schools are separated from those from the model schools.

The results were analysed within the theoretical context. Dobbin's (1996) criteria are used in order to assess the value of the practicums provided by the normal and model schools.

Turney's (Cruickshank, 1990) theory of possible conflict is addressed through an assessment of whether the COEs and the schools have common goals for the practicum, and how the goals are reached. The goals of the practicum are suggested as pedagogy, classroom management, curriculum coverage, assessment, teaching specific groups of students (such as Maori, those with special needs, and other ethnic groups), communication with parents, and school governance. Where possible, the same questions were put to the college practicum co-ordinators and to the normal and model schools so that the responses could be compared.

---

[1] In order to preserve confidentiality, all 6 institutions are referred to as COEs.

DESCRIPTION OF THE SCHOOLS

The normal and model schools are located in Auckland, Hamilton and district, Palmerston North, Wellington and district, Christchurch and district, and Dunedin. Seven of the model schools are situated outside the cities, but few could be called rural schools, since most of their contributing families work in the nearby city. The normal schools range in size from 190 to 690 students, while the model schools mainly have fewer than 100 students, as shown in table 1. The one larger model school is likely to be redesignated as a normal school.

Number of Students

Table 1
Number of Students

Normal Schools		Model Schools	
No. Students	No. Schools	No. Students	No. Schools
100–199	1	0–49	2
200–299	0	50–99	5
300–399	5	100–149	0
400–499	5	150–199	0
500–599	6	200–249	0
600–699	5	250–299	1

Socioeconomic Status of Schools

The schools have all been rated according to the socioeconomic status (SES) of the areas from which they draw students. The resulting decile was based on census data for the area from which each school draws students, along with school ethnicity data. The census data included equivalent household income, parents' occupation and educational qualifications, household crowding, and income support payments received.

Most of the schools are between deciles 6–10. This is mainly due to their location near the colleges of education, so that they are readily available to the trainees for practicums. It was pointed out by one focus group that they saw the higher ranking as an advantage for the trainees in that their main practicum experience was with students who were less likely to cause difficulties in the classroom. The trainees could develop their skills and confidence in a supportive environment. As one principal said, "It is best to learn to drive on safe roads—the back country or the motorways should come later".

One COE has designated an additional school in its area to be a normal school for the purpose of increasing the range of possible practicums. The school is decile 1, and the additional funding and allowances are paid by the COE.

Table 2

SES Decile of Normal and Model Schools

Decile	Incidence
3	1
4	0
5	1
6	3
7	5
8	2
9	3
10	15

Ethnicity of Students

The ethnicity of the students, as shown by table 3, confirms the SES classification. Only 4 schools had 20 percent or more of Maori students, compared with a national average of 20 percent (Ministry of Education, 1996). This contrasts with the number of schools with 20 percent or more of students from other ethnic groups, who were mainly Asian students. Two Auckland schools, for example, had 29 and 33 different cultures represented respectively among their students. The national average for Asian and other ethnic groups is around 6 percent.

Table 3

Ethnicity of Students: Incidence of Schools

Ethnicity	% Range				
	0–19	20–39	40–59	60–79	80–100
Pakeha	0	0	5	11	12
Maori	24	4	0	0	0
Pacific Island	28	0	0	0	0
Other (mainly Asian)	21	6	1	0	0

No response: 2. Model schools were mainly between 90–99 percent Pakeha.

Qualifications of Teachers

Teachers at normal and model schools are likely to have higher qualifications than those in the total population of primary schools, as shown by table 4. Teachers at model schools are mainly senior teachers. Normal schools are entitled to an additional staff position as part of their special status, mostly at G2 level.

Table 4

Qualifications of Teachers

	Normal %	Model %	Total Primary Teachers (1996) %
DipTchg, TTCert	35	28	49
Undergrad diploma, part-degree, Higher DipTchg	12	12	16
Degree, AdvDipTchg	52	60	31
Other	1	0	4

Note: Six normal school teachers and one model school teacher had masters degrees.

All of the schools said that they applied special criteria to staff selection. Most of the criteria were to do with their role in working with the trainees. The applicants had to show that they could work with and support adults, and be a role model for the trainees, while balancing the needs of the trainees with those of the students in their class. They were also expected to have proven experience and ability as a teacher, have good academic qualifications, be up to date professionally, and have competency across the curriculum, along with expertise in some specific sections of the curriculum. Flexibility, good communication skills, flair, and creativity were also looked for among the applicants. If beginning teachers were to be appointed, they were expected to have outstanding academic and practicum records.

Professional Development

All of the schools had professional development plans. Their focuses for 1997 were mainly curricular subjects, or related issues, such as assessment or management. Most of the schools included the trainee teachers currently placed at their schools within their professional development plan, especially if it was taking place at a staff meeting. Trainees would also take part in curriculum, syndicate, or team meetings, depending on their level and particular interests. In general, the schools felt that the trainees were so much a part of their system that they were automatically included in whatever was going on at the school.

Special Facilities Provided Due to Designation

All of the normal schools had had additional facilities provided in recognition of the additional needs arising from the constant presence of numbers of trainees. The facilities had been provided before the educational changes brought about by the "Tomorrow's Schools" reforms. Some schools commented that, due to increased roll numbers and higher demand from trainee teachers, they have had to get additional rooms or utilise previous special-purpose rooms as classrooms. Requests to the district offices of the Ministry of Education to take into account the needs of growing numbers of teacher trainees when approving new buildings had met with different responses from different districts according to the local interpretation of the building code, but generally such extras were seen as the responsibility of the COEs. Model schools have no additional facilities.

Special facilities which had been provided were demonstration rooms, group teaching or withdrawal rooms, enlarged classrooms, a common room or enlarged staffroom, and additions to the administration wing.

Special Funding Granted to the School To Recompense the Costs of Providing Teacher Education

All normal and model schools get a standard $5.20 per student and additional teaching allowances for the principal and all associate teachers. The normal schools also receive an additional staff member.

Some normal schools receive annual payments from their COEs mainly in order to cover the consumable expenses of the trainees. These payments range from $1000–$5000 per normal school, with another COE making specific payments to some schools for special services. Two COEs make no additional payments to the normal and model schools.

THE ROLE OF THE NORMAL AND MODEL SCHOOLS IN PRE-SERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION

Numbers of Trainees

The normal and model schools are used extensively by the COEs. Some have trainees in their schools constantly and are also used for micro-teaching and demonstration teaching. Table 5 shows the patterns of use.

Table 5

Patterns of Use for Terms 1–2, 1997

	Range	Average
Teaching practice		
Normal schools	9–148	57
Model schools	0*–12	7
Micro-teaching		
Normal schools	0–1600	381
Model schools+	0–117	22
Demonstration teaching		
Normal schools	0–240	72
Model schools	0	0
*Other***		
Normal schools	0–9	1
Model schools	0–5	0

* One model school had not been used in 1997 as transport was no longer available for trainees to do practicums there.

** "Other" includes academic assignments, pre-practicum days, lectures and discussions, special programmes and special-interest visits by trainees.

Schools that took a small number of trainees for teaching practice tended to take large numbers of students for demonstration and micro-teaching. For example, one school had 18 students for teaching practice and 1600 for demonstration teaching and micro-teaching; another had 9 students for teaching practice and 584 for demonstration and micro-teaching. However, a third had 148 for teaching practice and 1314 for demonstration teaching and micro-teaching!

Time Spent Specifically with Trainees

The schools were asked to estimate how much out-of-class time per week the teachers spent with trainees. There was general agreement about the following results:

	Time Spent per Week
Associate teachers	5–12 hours (but more likely to be 10–12)
G2/liaison teacher	5–10 hours
Deputy/associate principal	5–12 hours
Principal	About 5 hours

The associate teachers' time is spent in meetings and informal discussions with the trainees before and after school and during other break times, as well as time taken for preparation, organisation, and in-service training. They also liaise with the COE lecturers and attend assessment meetings. The G2/liaison teacher and the senior staff participate in observation and assessment, give briefings, assist with counselling of at-risk trainees, attend meetings at the COE or with the visiting lecturers and give demonstration lessons or assist with micro-teaching. Pastoral care for the trainees was also considered to be an important role played mainly by the associate teacher, and by senior staff when necessary. This could be quite time consuming especially if the student was having difficulty with aspects of the practicum. Most of the model schools said that all discussions must occur outside teaching commitment time, as they had principals who were also classroom teachers.

It was also pointed out that most schools have no break between postings and some classes might have 2 students at the same time, which means that the teachers may have a constant presence of trainees in their classes.

Teachers in normal schools may also be involved with in-service teacher training. Sometimes the COE directs teachers from other schools to courses, or demonstration teaching run by the normal schools.

Briefing for Trainee Teachers

The majority of normal and model schools provide special briefings for trainees at the beginning of the practicums. This briefing is usually conducted by the principal or the deputy principal. Briefing covers school and community background, family makeups, school expectations, administrative arrangements, statements of support, and commitment to practicums. It also covers the theoretical base to the school's philosophy and culture. About half of the schools provide induction packages. Briefing is also carried out through regular meetings with the associate teacher, the liaison teacher, and senior staff.

Feedback to Trainee Teachers on Their Practicum

The normal and model schools reported that they gave a great deal of feedback to the trainees throughout their practicums. In addition to the daily informal discussion with their associate teachers, they received oral feedback from the senior staff, especially the deputy principal and the principal. All trainees received a written report at the end of the practicum, usually written by the associate teacher, with comments by the principal or deputy principal. Some were given weekly progress reports, and a number of associate teachers gave written feedback on any lessons, called critique lessons, taken by the trainee.

Training for Associate Teachers

Most of the special training for the associate teachers is provided by the schools themselves. About a third attended courses at the COE. One COE was trialling a distance education training package for associate teachers.

Activities Conducted as Part of the Practicums During Terms 1 and 2 of 1997

Most schools listed all activities conducted by their school during the period, which included many that were not necessarily specific to the practicums. However, it is clear that any trainees in the school would have been included in them.

Specific curricular activities included demonstration lessons, focus discussions with the school management team, teacher-only days, informal meetings, lectures, workshops, appraisal or critique lessons, and micro-teaching. Other curricular activities carried out by the schools were very wide-ranging. They included special workshops on aspects of the curriculum, projects across the curriculum, such as "food-gathering", and presentations of special topics from specialists outside the school. Trainees were also involved with the schools' sporting activities, both as part of regular school sports coaching, and in interschool sports and special sports days. They also attended camps and outdoor education activities if these coincided with their placement at the schools. Some trainees, especially the physical education specialists, assisted with coaching teams at some schools outside their placement time.

The trainees were included with any cultural activities at most of the schools. These included Maori activities and programmes based on the cultures of the other ethnic groups at the schools. Music, art, and speech contests were also mentioned by a number of the schools.

Informal and social activities were an important source of indirect learning for the trainees. They were included in the social life of the schools, such as morning teas and lunches with the staff, as well as formal social events with the staff and with the students. It was suggested that informal mixing with the students often helped a trainee to be accepted within the classroom.

RELATIONSHIPS WITH THE COLLEGES OF EDUCATION

The responses from both the normal and model schools, and from the practicum co-ordinators at the COEs, showed that most normal schools worked very closely with their COEs. The co-ordinators stated that the links were much closer than those they had with other schools which provided practicums. This was in part due to the geographic proximity of the normal schools and the COEs, and partly due to the specific designation of the schools, but it also appeared that there were many other reasons for the links. Most model schools are located farther from the COEs; their relationships therefore tended to be less close.

Membership of College of Education Committees

The COE practicum co-ordinators reported that teachers from normal schools were more likely than those from the other schools to be on subject, teaching experience, and other advisory committees. Most of the normal schools said that their associate teachers were represented on the COE committees. Some principals, and some of the deputy principals, were also on COE committees. Some of the COEs included staff from normal schools on recruitment panels for new trainees, and some schools would include a COE representative on interview panels for their staff.

Teaching Staff as Lecturers at the Colleges of Education

Five of the 6 COEs had teachers from normal schools as regular lecturers for units such as teaching practice, or as guest lecturers for special topics. The COEs and the schools would also collaborate for micro-teaching. Teachers from model schools were less likely to teach at the COEs, possibly because most did not have an additional teacher or a non-teaching principal which could make it easier to make time available for the purpose.

Meetings

Regular formal meetings occurred between the COEs and the normal schools. These meetings included regular meetings between the principals and the senior staff at the college; frequent meetings between the liaison teachers and the co-ordinators, mainly about placement of trainees; and meetings between associate teachers and lecturers during and around the practicums. Some co-ordinators also said that they did research together with the teachers, and others were able to use the schools for research purposes.

There is also a great deal of informal liaison between teachers and lecturers, which arises from the constant presence of trainees in the schools. One of the co-ordinators described this liaison as "daily open communication lines", and another said that she used the teachers as her mentors. Typical examples of informal contact were about trainees with difficulties, commonly described as "at risk" (of failing their course), or about last-minute placements.

Some of the informal meetings occurred socially. It appeared that the frequent liaison often resulted in friendships among staff of the different institutions.

Special Training and Feedback Provided by Colleges of Education

About half of the schools had access to special training courses provided by the COEs for associate teachers. Sometimes these were for new associates, and other COEs regularly provided courses to explain changes at the college, such as triadic assessment. One COE awarded an annual half-time lectureship for a teacher from a normal school who wanted to work towards a masterate in education.

Most of the schools received feedback from the COEs about the practicums. They said they used the information in order to evaluate their practices and programmes, and to make modifications if necessary. They saw the feedback as a valuable way of improving assessment and communication, and as a way of increasing their awareness of the needs of trainees.

Preparation of Trainee Teachers by the College of Education for the Practicum

A third of the schools reported that the trainees were "very well" prepared for the practicum. They attributed this to their close liaison with the COE, and the matching of the COE's theory with their practice.

Half of the other schools felt that the trainees were "adequately" prepared. They stated a number of reasons why they thought there could be some improvement in the preparation of the trainees, which were similar to the reasons given by the third group of respondents.

The rest of the schools considered that the trainees were "variably" prepared for their practicum experience. They explained that it depended very much upon the trainee's stage of training and personality. Some trainees needed a great deal of support and guidance, especially if they had limited experience in behaviour management. A few schools said that they felt that the COE's prior training, especially in professional studies and the coverage of some curriculum areas was inadequate, so that the school seemed to be expected to fill the gaps in theory. The demands of the trainees' university work could also cause problems, in that they might be forced to decide between preparation for the practicum and completing a university assignment.

No schools said that the trainees were "poorly" prepared for the practicums.

The most frequently suggested changes were improvements to the liaison process: better briefings before placements; or COE lecturers based in schools during the practicums. Some wanted changes to the COE courses, including more curriculum training, a return to the formerly taught "principles and practices of teaching", training in leadership and management skills, and a module on the emerging adolescent. Other suggestions were for a refinement of the trainee assessment process, and that trainees should have weekly contact with a home class. Model schools asked for raised awareness of rural and small schools and of teaching principals.

THE GOALS OF THE PRACTICUM

The schools and the co-ordinators were both given a list of suggested goals for the teaching practicum. They were asked to rank the goals from 1 to 7, and to add or delete from the list if they wished. The co-ordinators found it difficult to be hierarchical with the first 4, as demonstrated by the closeness of the total scores. The schools and co-ordinators agreed on a ranking for the goals for all but pedagogy and curriculum coverage. The results are set out in table 6.

Table 6
Goals of the Practicum

	Schools		Co-ordinators	
Goal	Total	Rank	Total	Rank
Classroom management	49	1	8	1
Pedagogy	62	2	11	3
Curriculum coverage	82	3	9	2
Assessment	112	4	13	4
Teaching specific groups (Maori, CWSN[a], CWSA[b], ESOL[c], etc.)	150	5	21	5
Communication with parents	168	6	37	6
School governance	203	7	38	7

[a] Children with special needs
[b] Children with special abilities
[c] English as a second or other language

Other suggestions from individual respondents were "understanding children", "planning", "practising a wide range of the curriculum subjects", and "seeing a variety of teaching styles".

Comments from schools were:

> Classroom management is vital—all of the theory in the world is not effective without it.
>
> You need to master classroom management before applying theory to content.

Co-ordinators' Expectations of Schools and What the Normal and Model Schools Do To Assist Trainees To Reach the Goals

The co-ordinators were asked what specific assistance they expected schools to provide for trainee teachers to reach the goals of the practicum. The schools were asked what specific assistance they provided for the trainees to reach the goals. When the 2 sets of responses are aligned, it can be seen how closely they match each other. The responses set out below are in the words of the respondents as much as possible.

Classroom Management

Co-ordinators	*Schools*
• Chance to try out theory, including taking risks	• Provide chance to link theory to classroom practice, encouraging risks
• Modelling ways of management of time and learning	• Role modelling variety of approaches
• Explaining school policies, programmes and resources, including discipline	• Discussion/workshops, written resources, about policies and strategies
• Feedback on performance, suggesting strategies	• Discussion and written feedback from associate teacher and senior staff; video for self-reflection
• Support of trainees if they have problems	• Backup support/co-operate with COE

Model schools mentioned that they also provide experience in management in a small, multilevel school, and the culture of such a school.

Pedagogy

Co-ordinators	*Schools*
• Modelling strategies for programme design and implementation in a positive and stimulating environment	• Role modelling range of approaches, demonstration lessons
• Putting theory and concepts into practice	• Linking theory to practice
• Critical evaluation and effective supervision	• Critical evaluation, backup support
• Communicating effectively with the trainee	• Meetings, discussion, written resources, help with assignments, also from senior staff
• Match research and theory to individual needs	• Individual programmes

Model schools included the opportunity to experience cross-peer learning.

Curriculum Coverage

Co-ordinators	*Schools*
• Chance to cover whole curriculum	• Specialists for all levels of curriculum
• Integration of content knowledge and practice, with learning outcomes reflecting individual needs, flexibility for trainees to try things	• Chance to experiment in area of specialisation with support and supervision
• Modelling up-to-date teaching practice	• Role modelling
• Advice on how particular schools interpret philosophy and aims for each part of the curriculum framework	• Discussion, planning, staff and team meetings, written materials
• Supportive and critical feedback	• Feedback on classroom practice

Model schools also offer the chance to see a wide range of levels within the curriculum.

Assessment

Co-ordinators	*Schools*
• Associate teacher explains and models systems, including ways of making school's assessment friendly; reports to boards of trustees (BOTs), parents, and students	• Learn school assessment procedures, through discussions/workshops and written materials
• Chance to try out different methods	• Use assessment procedures, assist with reviews and research
• Do self-assessment/reflection	• Guided reflection
• Assessment of specific groups	

Teaching Specific Groups of Students

Co-ordinators	*Teachers*
• Learn how groups fit into programmes	• Discussion, practice with groups
• Understand teacher's ability to focus on and support diversity	• Case studies, role modelling
• Every student has to be culturally aware and teach Maori students/need bilingual	• See te reo/bilingual classes
• See wide range of ethnic groups including ESOL students	• Groups available, NESB (non-English-speaking background), other languages

Co-ordinators	*Teachers*
• See special needs, including reading recovery; and gifted children	• Special needs and extension students
• See rural students	• Rural/urban mix at model schools

Communication with Parents

Co-ordinators	*Teachers*
• Modelling professional relationship through consultation with community	• Trainees observe parent interviews
• Third-year assignment, working with child and parent, supported	• Third-year trainees do interviews with selected parents
• Maybe sit in on meetings	• Attend PTA (Parent Teacher Association) meetings
• Discussion with associate teacher; fundraising reporting strategies	• Discussion, prepare or help to prepare newsletters; written materials
• Should be able to meet a wide range of parents, formally and informally	• Parents at school daily, in class and staffroom, also at sport and other activities

Not all co-ordinators and schools thought it was necessary for the trainees to meet parents. One school said it was "not an issue—they are kept away from parents"; and a co-ordinator said "only if supervised".

School Governance

Co-ordinators	*Teachers*
• Third year trainees: explanation of BOT functions, NEGs (national education guidelines) and NAGs (national administration guidelines), ERO (Education Review Office) reviews, by principal	• Discussed at principal's meeting
• All trainees should see documents	• Written materials available, including BOT minutes, charter
• Third-year trainees sit in on BOT meetings	• May attend BOT meetings, staff administration meetings

This was also seen by some co-ordinators and schools as not necessary.

Differences in the Way that Normal and Model Schools Assist Trainee Teachers To Reach These Goals, Compared with Other Schools in the Region

The co-ordinators were generally agreed that, for each of the 7 goals, there were differences in the services provided by normal and model schools, compared with the other schools providing practicums in the region. Only 1 of the 6 co-ordinators could see few differences between the groups of schools, and stated that differences tended to depend upon the qualities of individual teachers.

Pedagogy

The teachers in normal and model schools were seen as more experienced with trainees. As a result of the closer links, they understood the needs of the COE. They had a greater commitment to teacher education, which was part of their ethos, to the extent that it was included in school charters. The teachers were up to date with research and professional development, tending to have better qualifications than those at the other schools. They could thus provide better role models and give more informed critiques and feedback, taking time to explain matters to the trainees. They were also prepared to do micro-teaching and to take trainees at risk.

Classroom Management

The normal and model schools' total approach was seen as reliable and up to date, whereas there was variability among teachers in the other schools. The normal and model schools modelled good practice and strategies, and were more organised to deal with and talk to the trainees. Individual teachers had specific strengths—many of them were used to lecture at the COE.

Curriculum Coverage

Half of the co-ordinators said that there was no difference between normal and model schools and the other schools in terms of curriculum content; however, most of the co-ordinators felt that the teachers at the normal and model schools were more flexible and co-operative than those at the others. They were prepared to focus on particular areas in order to meet trainee needs and to do micro-teaching and model lessons as needed. Since the schools had up-to-date specialists across the curriculum, the trainees could cover all areas; the schools were also very willing to make their resources available to the trainees. One co-ordinator also commented that if the COE was looking for contract staff members to teach professional development, they would go to a normal school.

Assessment

The trainees were more likely to see current best practice at the normal and model schools than at the other schools. Their teachers were readily accessible, and the principal's talk to the trainees was especially valued.

Teaching Specific Groups of Students

The co-ordinators mentioned the range of groups available at the normal and model schools. They included mainstreamed, special-needs students and extension classes. Many of the schools had Asian students and those from other ethnic groups, including refugees, many of whom spoke English as a second language. The greatest lack appeared to be Maori students.

Communication with Parents

Due to the partnership between the COEs and the normal and model schools, the lecturers felt able to ask the schools to let the trainees, especially third-year trainees, observe parent interviews. Teachers from the normal schools lectured on this topic at some COEs.

School Governance

The principal or the liaison teacher at the normal and model schools discussed this topic with trainees. Trainees at some schools, especially those in their third year, met boards of trustees.

Other Differences between Practicums Provided by the Normal and Model Schools and Those at the Other Schools (from Co-ordinators)

Facilities

The normal schools were described as having a number of facilities that were geared to the needs of trainee teachers. The schools were also seen as more willing to share their resources. Examples of the special facilities at some schools included a demonstration room, withdrawal rooms, extra offices, bigger classrooms, and a common room. One school had a base classroom for the COE's 1-year intensive group, used for half a day per week for the first semester.

Specific Activities

The co-ordinators said that the normal and model schools were more likely than the others to include trainees in activities such as camps and other outdoor events, sports coaching, and performing arts, as well as general social activities. The trainees would also have the benefit of micro-teaching and demonstration lessons. One co-ordinator commented that "students (trainees) share duties with the associate—share all aspects of the associate's role".

Supervision and Assessment of the Trainee Teachers

Most of the co-ordinators said that the standards of observation and assessment were higher at the normal and model schools. The associate teachers gave constructive feedback and criticism, and were prepared to be negative if necessary. Four COEs had joint assessment procedures, such as triadic assessment. The normal and model schools had clear expectations of the trainees, and were prepared to identify trainees who were having difficulties, and to do more indepth reporting than that done at the other schools. The involvement of the deputy principals of the normal schools with the assessment of trainees was also appreciated. The co-ordinators felt that the closer relationship between the COE and teachers at the normal and model schools greatly facilitated the assessment and support process.

THE ADVANTAGES OF PLACING TRAINEES IN PRACTICUMS AT THE NORMAL AND MODEL SCHOOLS

The Co-ordinators' Views

All of the co-ordinators could list positive benefits for the trainees from placements in the normal and model schools. They said that these schools could be relied upon for quality, up-to-date practice and innovative teaching. The co-ordinators thought that the associate teachers were more articulate because they were ". . . used to having a shadow to talk to".

Due to the close collegial and supportive relationship, the schools understood the expectations of the COE. The normal schools offered the trainees an opportunity to see a busy school with a high level of management and organisation. These schools had well-organised placement procedures and were prepared to be flexible with "at risk" trainees, and other special requirements of the COE. Trainees could see a range of groups and contexts at the normal schools, especially Asian and ethnic groups other than Maori, Pakeha, or Pacific Island, as well as the family groupings at rural model schools. The normal schools often had a research base. In general the co-ordinators felt that the normal and model schools provided an environment that was committed to trainees as colleagues.

One COE said that they could expect more from the normal and model schools due to their designation and special allowances. There were also financial incentives for the COEs to work with these schools since they did not have to pay associate teacher allowances, and travel allowances to the trainees.

The Views of the Normal and Model Schools

The normal and model schools were asked a number of questions in order to assess their opinions more fully. All said that there were advantages for their schools which arose from the special designation. They gave 6 advantages, to which a seventh was added at the focus groups. The 3 focus groups were then asked to rank the advantages in order of importance. There was some divergence of opinion between the regions as shown by the total scores in table 7.

Table 7

Advantages of Designation as Normal or Model School

Advantage	Score	Rank
Innovative programmes with up-to-date reflective teachers	3	1
Total management team/whole school supports trainees	8	2
Funding, teacher allowances, extra teacher or all senior teachers—more facilities and resources, better staff:student ratios	10	3
Good career path for teachers	14	4=
Good reputation, recognition of special character	14	4=
Trainees provide a fresh focus, bring specialist skills and knowledge	16	6
Access through close liaison with COE to personnel and resources	18	7

The schools expanded the detail in the above list in the response to another question. They explained that they were able to cover the full curriculum with specialist teachers. They were also prepared to adapt their programmes to meet the needs of trainees, working closely with the COE to plan and evaluate the practicums. The model schools indicated the advantages to the trainees of being able

to see a total school operation within one or two classrooms where there was a co-operative family atmosphere which also fostered the independent learning skills of students.

The schools pointed out that their designation and reputation meant that they were able to attract quality staff, who were appointed for their experience with, and empathy for, adults. This was borne out by the number of teachers who were on outside committees, such as national curriculum committees. Many of the principals of normal and model schools were recognised leaders in New Zealand primary and intermediate education, holding positions on a number of national and regional bodies concerned with both administration and curriculum advice. A number are regularly asked to lead in-service training courses.

Most of the normal and model schools had a range of up-to-date resources. However, some indicated that it was difficult to maintain the supply, especially of consumables, due to heavy usage and the high costs involved.

Another advantage was the formation of the Normal School Principals' Association. This organisation met both nationally and regionally on a regular basis, as well as holding teleconferences among members. Principals were thus able to share innovations, discuss best practice, and generally work on professional development for themselves and their staff. Each region had a representative on the council of the local COE. The association liaised with the Ministry of Education and other organisations as necessary and generally operated to promote the functions of normal and model schools.

The Flow-on Effects from Involvement with the Practicums

Schools

These were seen as benefiting from involvement in practicums in that they developed a culture of teacher education with guidance and support for the trainees, and were at the "cutting edge of innovations". It was felt that parents, the BOT, and the local community valued the special status of the school which led to its reputation. This was borne out by the schools' having more enrolments than they could handle, including those from foreign fee-paying students. The schools reported that the trainees' enthusiasm, skills, and cultural mix added positively to school culture. They could provide a wider range of programmes and activities due to the constant presence of the trainees.

Students

The students benefited in that they had contact with a wider range of adults of different ages, gender, and ethnic mix. They had access to current ideas and a greater range of specialist skills, with increased attention in class, groups, and as individuals, due to the presence of additional adults in the room. They also benefited from the energy and enthusiasm, and the variety of skills and personalities of trainees, both in the classroom and in the playground. One school pointed out that the students supported and helped the trainees.

Teachers

Teachers were seen as motivated by contact with the trainees, through their new ideas and enthusiasm. Since there were more adults to share tasks, they had time to observe, reflect, do individual work with students, or prepare resources. The challenge of the constant presence of trainees encouraged them to maintain their qualifications through ongoing professional development. The professional links with a COE gave them an opportunity for regular evaluation of their progress

and practice, as well as exposure to more overseas educationists. The teachers also valued the chance to influence future teaching practice.

Evidence of Positive Outcomes from Involvement in Trainee Teacher Education

Trainee Teacher Satisfaction

A number of the schools conducted surveys at the end of the practicum or arranged meetings for the trainees with the associate teacher and senior staff in order to evaluate the practicum. They found that comments were mainly favourable. Most of the schools reported that trainees wanted to return as teachers, aides, or relief teachers. The trainees often kept in touch with the schools, seeking references, coaching sport, or returning for informal visits to staff. Gifts and grateful letters were other means of showing satisfaction. Feedback from the COEs usually indicated trainee satisfaction with the practicum, which was also displayed by the number of trainees who sent their own children to the schools.

College of Education Satisfaction

The COEs mainly expressed satisfaction through informal communication from lecturers, or through positive feedback to senior staff at committees. Requests for increased or special usage, for example, for "at risk" trainees, were also reported, as were letters of thanks. The COEs sometimes sent teachers from other schools for in-service training. One school stated that it had had 100 overseas visitors in 1996—others confirmed that they also had high numbers of visitors sent by the COEs, or brought by other local people, for example, to observe curriculum innovation. Some visitors go to the schools in large groups.

Relevant Material from the Most Recent Education Review Office Report

Two-thirds of the schools commented that, in spite of direct requests, ERO had not commented on their special character as a normal or model school. Positive comments from the latest ERO report were included, most of which referred to high standards being maintained in all areas, which could be said to confirm the schools' own perceptions of the advantages which accrued to them from their designation. Typical examples of comments were:

> The quality of teacher development is a significant aspect of the school's operations. The outcomes of this are evident in the quality of classroom programmes. Teachers have managed the introduction of new curricula well. Well-organised curriculum committees provide up-to-date direction for teachers as well as reviewing subject areas on a regular planned cycle.

> The overall quality of learning programmes is high and some programmes are outstanding. . . . Effective programmes are in place to support and guide students. . . . The school climate is affirming and positive for students.

Relevant comments from the 11 schools where ERO had commented on the special character of the school included:

> Another effective quality assurance practice is the impact that students from [the College of Education] make upon the school. Their enthusiastic contributions and continual questioning on curriculum matters add to the delivery of an effective curriculum. (Model school)
>
> The school is well resourced with teaching materials and has many extra facilities to support the activities undertaken with the [COE] trainees. The school fulfils all requests made by College staff. . . . Under the Normal School relationship with the COE there are special provisions for staffing and similar facilities at the school. These are of considerable benefit in supporting effective delivery of the curriculum. . . .The deputy principal of the school is responsible for liaison with the COE. The requests made by the College are many and varied. Teacher trainees are provided with special opportunities in the school programmes and staff are also involved in contributing to some College programmes. The College liaison lecturer expressed appreciation of the high level of support given by the principal and staff to the College and the positive working relationship that has developed. (Normal School)

The latter was the most comprehensive comment by the ERO.

DISADVANTAGES ARISING FROM DESIGNATION AS NORMAL OR MODEL SCHOOLS

Co-ordinators

The co-ordinators could suggest very few disadvantages in placing students in practicums at the normal and model schools. Half of them said that sometimes the trainees were reluctant to go to the normal schools as they thought that, due to the over-exposure to trainees, students became "trainee-wise". Some trainees perceived that they would be lost in a large school, and others thought they would be monitored more closely; however, the co-ordinators found that trainees returning from practicums were very positive about the experience. The co-ordinators were concerned about the possible effect on children of a steady stream of trainees, with consequent interruptions to their programme. The normal and model schools were at a disadvantage in that they did not have a fully representative range of students, with few Maori or lower socioeconomic group students.

Model schools tended not to have true country students any more, since most of the schools were based in commuter areas. Rural schools caused travel problems for trainees doing university courses.

Specific Problems for the Schools Arising from the Provision of Practicums

Most of the schools agreed that there were problems arising from their extensive participation in practicums. They had all devised ways to overcome the disadvantages to their schools arising from the problems.

The most frequently mentioned problem was the overload for teachers, sometimes with only 1 week or less between trainees. They were also involved with demonstration and micro-teaching. Some teachers had 2 trainees in 1 class. They coped with this by negotiating numbers of trainees with the COE in order to protect their students; this usually resulted in better timetabling of trainees. The senior teachers took care also to share the timetabling of trainees equably among the associate teachers.

The schools said that they had to maintain a balance between the needs of the trainees and those of the students in order to minimise disruption of class routines and inconsistent curriculum delivery. They found that their students became accustomed to flexibility in their programmes. Management of this situation was seen as part of the school's total management package.

Normal and model schools found that many of the "at risk" trainees had poor behaviour management so that the students took the opportunity to misbehave. They asked the COEs to identify and timetable these trainees, so that they could place them appropriately with associate teachers. They maintained careful liaison with the trainees, giving extra time for counselling and assessment with the COE.

The costs of resources, especially consumables, were another problem, often exceeding the additional revenue given to the schools for this purpose. The schools had to maintain tight controls over the issuing and return of resources, and often sought additional funding for the consumable items.

Some of the schools suffered from overcrowding, especially in their staffrooms. They had to ensure that the timetabling of trainees did not exceed capacity.

Careful measures had to be taken in order to maintain the confidence of parents. Public relations were seen as very important, both among parents and in the wider community.

There were sometimes clashes of trainee programmes between micro-teaching and practicums. This situation could be used as a training experience, with the practicum students becoming observers and peer-review critics of the micro-teaching.

One school mentioned the problem of having the status of normal and model schools under review (due to the recommendation of the ministerial reference group). They attempted to address the issue through making submissions, but commented on the amount of time necessary for that process. This problem was identified in the focus groups as a general concern.

CHANGES IN THE TEACHER EDUCATION ENVIRONMENT CURRENT AND IN THE FUTURE

Teacher education in New Zealand is undergoing considerable change at present.

> Prior to 1989 there were six providers of primary and secondary education in New Zealand. . . . Now there are 16 directly-funded providers of school teacher training and another 10 stakeholders who act as bases for programmes developed by the main institutions. These 26 providers operate currently from 28 places of provision. (Julian & Meade, 1997)

All of the schools were affected in some way by the changes. Some COEs were amalgamating with their local universities, a number were shortening their 4-year courses by a year in order to remain competitive with the 3-year bachelor of teaching courses already being offered in other parts of the country. They all anticipated changes to the practicums from their traditional COE partners and possibly increased demands from new providers. They thought that the practicums might be shortened, or condensed with second- and third-year trainees sharing placements. They also expected more trainees, including more bilingual and ESOL trainees.

Some schools had been approached by new providers. Most had refused to take their trainees, due to requirements under the legislation (which designated them as normal and model schools "for a specified college of education"), the lack of time and resources, and loyalty to the COE. Some had entered into discussions with the new providers and mentioned the incentives being offered, such as the level of financial recompense, and teacher release days.

Concern was expressed by the schools and in the focus groups about the proliferation of providers. They did not see it as an advantage and felt that it could lead to greater pressure on their schools to provide practicums. They also wondered about the quality control of the courses, whose standards were untested, and where the graduates would be placed.

Steps being taken to accommodate the changes mainly focused on strenthening the relationship between the schools and the COE, even to the extent of entering into formal contracts. They were arranging more training for the associate teachers, to keep abreast of new developments, and also programming more release time for staff, mentoring, and group discussions. Changes being planned to accommodate extra numbers included more facilities, and more ESOL or bilingual programmes. They said that they were open to change and were regularly reviewing and upgrading their practice to conform with changes in the practicums, while ensuring that they maintained high standards of teaching. Induction packages were being developed for the trainees. However, there had to be a ceiling for trainees to allow breaks for teachers and to ensure that:

> Learning and teaching of students is first priority—we will balance fairness to the students with the best courses for the trainees.

They would cope with change as they had before:

> We will survive—laugh, and provide release for staff.

FINAL COMMENTS

Both groups of respondents were asked if they had any final comments. The co-ordinators all took the opportunity to state their support for the system of normal and model schools, saying that they were a valuable asset.

> I value the links—would put trainees there every practicum, couldn't do without them.
>
> We depend on them for balance between theory and practice—quality assurance. I affirm the collegial relationship which is very important.
>
> [Model schools]: trainees like the small family atmosphere, good to see multi-levels, and a teaching principal.
>
> We couldn't run our programmes effectively without them. If they were abolished we would need to make contractual arrangements with schools to provide practicums. The contracts would be with the same schools because of their quality, proximity, and cultural mix. They are the core of the practicum programme.
>
> I would be sorry to see the normal schools go—we have good relationships and like their flexibility. But we need the other [ordinary] schools as well. Not all schools are topnotch—students [trainees] need to have a clear understanding of the differences and see a variety of approaches. They need to learn self-reliance and other kinds of skills.

Most of the comments by the schools repeated the advantages previously described. Extra comments included:

> Trainees need to develop confidence and competence in a supportive environment before being exposed to testing situations.
>
> The whole school is a role model. It is a base for educational research and curriculum trials and provides a total quality practicum. It is creative, innovative and cost effective. We know what works, with knowledge built up over time.
>
> The relationship with the COE is the critical component. It is a partnership, based on mutual understanding and sharing of skills. We match their theory with sound practice. [We are] critical to the success of the new courses.
>
> [We have] stable, flexible, experienced staff, who welcome trainees and accept their development needs. Their training is the second most important thing we do.
>
> We have resources, buildings and up-to-date technology as well as quality assessment and reporting.

And some warnings:

> Close normal schools and you lower the quality of teacher training.
>
> Associates from other schools may be unsuitable.

Finally:

> We need to enhance the model, not close it down.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

It appears from the research that the main differences between the normal and model schools, and the other schools which provide practicums, is the focus on pre-service teacher education. Normal and model schools include the practicums as part of their core business. Many include the role in their charter statements. All aspects of their work, from the recruitment of teachers, the planning of programmes, and even their extracurricular activities, are based on the assumption that trainees are a key part of the system. The COEs have a great deal of confidence in the schools, using them for the majority of their placements, as well as for any special training needs, such as micro-teaching or demonstration teaching.

The comments of both the schools and the COE co-ordinators show the close partnership that exists between most of the schools and the COEs in order to bring about the most effective training for the trainees. There is frequent, almost daily, liaison between the lecturers and the associate teachers which leads to early identification of potential problems, and joint measures to overcome the problems. Many of the associate teachers and senior staff are on COE committees, and it is clear that the staff at the normal and model schools can function as comfortably in an adult education environment as they can with school students.

The normal and model schools also seem to meet the criteria for a successful practicum postulated by Dobbie (1996) and Cruickshank (1990). Dobbie's criteria were:

"Focus on the classroom, school, and community"
Most of the schools provide full induction programmes with senior staff, as well as written materials covering all aspects of the school's operations. The trainees are based in classrooms, but they also participate in all aspects of the school's activities. Many of them meet parents, both informally and formally. Through the trainees' extracurricular work, they also have chances to experience the school in its community context.

"Take account of both intended and unintended learning outcomes that result from a practicum experience"
Associate teachers at the normal and model schools give a great deal of out-of-class time to the trainees. They provide both written and oral feedback on any practical work done by the trainee, and also explain their own teaching practices. They see themselves as consciously modelling management strategies. The senior staff also spend guidance and counselling time with the trainees.

"Provide times for action and reflection"
The timetabling of the trainees allows for as much practical experience as is considered appropriate to their level of training, following consultation with the COE lecturers. Time is also allowed for observation and feedback, all of which should lead to reflection.

"Allow for individual needs to be met"
The schools are in close consultation with the COEs. The practicums are carefully planned to take account of trainees' areas of specialisation, or any areas of difficulty that they may be experiencing. Teachers are chosen for their flexibility, and the school's culture reflects a philosophy of meeting the needs of trainees without losing sight of the needs of the students.

"Create opportunities for collaborative learning situations"

Collaborative learning occurs through the close relationship between the associate teacher and the trainee, where the trainee is accepted as another adult in the classroom. The schools acknowledge the benefits they get from the presence of the trainees, especially the contribution of new ideas and fresh enthusiasm. Collaborative learning also arises from group discussions and group teaching situations, which are a regular part of most practicum programmes.

Cruickshank (1990) stresses the importance of the partnership among the "student teaching triad", the need for similar understandings of the goals of the practicum, and common perceptions of effective practice. The COE practicum co-ordinators agreed very closely with the schools about the goals and ranked the items similarly. Some of the COEs had introduced triadic assessment, and others were using collaborative methods between themselves and the schools. Since trainees were not included within the project, it is not clear whether they shared the perception of common purpose. The only data available are anecdotal, from the schools and the co-ordinators; both reported trainee satisfaction with the practicums. Some of the co-ordinators said that the trainees were initially reluctant to go to the schools, but they had revised their opinions by the end of the practicums. The COEs all agreed that they considered the schools to be an essential part of their programmes. As one co-ordinator said "If we had to do without them, we would have to reinstate them".

The only major disadvantage of the normal and model schools was that they did not cover the full SES decile range, and that trainees did not get adequate opportunities to work with Maori students at normal and model schools. One COE overcame the problem by designating an additional normal school in its catchment area. Given the pressure on the current normal and model schools, this would appear to be a useful way of alleviating the problem. It would work to the benefit of both the newly designated school through its corresponding increase in status and additional funding, and would assist the COE to place trainees in a full range of normal schools.

Differences between Normal and Model Schools

A number of differences emerged between the normal schools and the full model schools (as distinct from the model classrooms or units operating within a normal school). The close relationships between the model schools[2] and the COEs were less evident than were those between the normal schools and the COE. This was partly a function of their location and partly because they had teaching principals with little class time available for liaison with the COEs. The model schools did not qualify for extra facilities or for an additional teacher; however, they have mainly senior teachers in recognition of their status. Most of the model schools were not used as extensively as were the normal schools. Geographic location was one of the reasons for this, especially for trainees who had university commitments.

However, the normal schools were seen as being an important provider of practicum experience. They afforded an opportunity for the trainees to experience a multilevel small school with an emphasis on individual learning programmes. They also had an opportunity to observe a principal who was also a classroom teacher, with the implications for school management arising from the combined role.

---

[2] The large model school, which is likely to be redesignated as a normal school, is excluded for the purpose of this discussion.

Economic Factors

It seems clear that the normal and model schools meet most of the requirements for an effective practicum within their individual schools. The COEs state that they know they can rely on these schools for consistent best practice. They can find some of the elements they require in other schools, but the skills are scattered among individual teachers. If there were no normal and model schools, no schools would be legally obligated to take trainees and the COEs would have to negotiate individual services from a wide range of schools, thereby incurring considerably higher costs than those covered by current allowances and salaries to the normal and model schools.

If the normal and model schools were to lose their designation, they would also lose their special status. They may find it harder to attract quality teachers and the COEs would no longer have readily accessible, high-standard schools for their practicums. Again, higher costs would be incurred.

Conclusions

From both an educational and an economic perspective, it can be seen that the normal and model schools serve a valuable and essential function. Given the proliferation of providers, it appears that more such schools, rather than fewer, are necessary. However, it is also important that the high standards achieved by the current schools are required of the new ones. The initial practical experience of the trainee teachers is vitally important. It is often the most influential factor for them in their own approach to teaching. Although it is important that teacher trainees see a variety of standards of teaching and that they include difficult schools among their practicum experience, they must have examples of excellence against which they can measure the others in order to develop their own personal teaching values. Reflective teachers must have a sound basis for their judgments. Their "learning journeys" must give them ample opportunities for such reflection.

REFERENCES

Cruickshank, D. R. (1990). *Research that informs teachers and teacher educators.* Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Dobbins, R. (1996). The practicum: A learning journey? *Waikato Journal of Education, 2.* Hamilton: University of Waikato.

Julian, R., & Meade, A. (1997, July). *Teachers, and teacher education and development: Issues and research priorities.* Unpublished paper prepared for the APEID regional meeting of directors of educational research and development institutes. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Ministerial Reference Group. (1995). *Resource entitlement for school staffing: The report.* Wellington: Ministry of Education.

Ministry of Education. (1996). *Education statistics 1996.* Wellington: Ministry of Education.

Shaw, H. (1997). *Report on the current arrangements between pre-service teacher training providers and schools including the normal schools: Prepared for the review of teacher education.* (Unpublished). Wellington: Ministry of Education.

APPENDIX 1

Evaluation of the Role Of Normal and Model Schools

Questionnaire for Schools

This questionnaire is part of the evaluation of normal and model schools, commissioned by the Normal School Principals' Association, and undertaken by the New Zealand Council for Educational Research (NZCER).

NZCER is an independent organisation whose purpose is to promote quality education for New Zealand through research and resources, advice and information.

The Council's staff adhere to a statement of ethics which ensure that your responses will be held in **complete confidence**. Individuals will not be identifiable in any way from this study. The questionnaire is coded solely for the purpose of administering the responses.

the objective of this study is to provide:

* an independent resource to support any submissions by the Association to counter moves to reduce the current role of Normal and Model Schools;

* an accurate view of the scope of the activities undertaken by Normal and Model Schools to be used by individual schools or the Association in any discussions or negotiations with providers of teacher education;

* some indicators for future development for Normal and Model schools to position themselves to take advantage of the changing teacher education environment.

Instructions

Please answer this questionnaire
by ticking all boxes that apply, **and/or**
by writing in the space provided

NORMAL AND MODEL SCHOOLS EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Please describe your school and your school community:

Number

(a) Students _____

(b) Staffing entitlement _____

(c) Grade of additional teacher (TNSD) _____

(d) Qualifications of Teachers:

Dip teaching only _____

degree level _____

postgraduate diploma _____

Other (*describe*) _____

(e) MOE (socio-economic) decile — Ethnicity of students:

European/Pakeha _____

Māori _____

Pacific Island _____

Other _____

(f) Special facilities (buildings/rooms etc) provided because normal/model school

_____

_____

(g) Special funding granted to the school to recompense the costs of providing teacher education – *give details*:

(i) From Ministry of Education

_____

_____

(ii) From other sources - *specify*

_____

_____

2. Are there any special criteria which you apply when selecting staff?

Yes ❑ No ❑

If yes, what are they?

_____

_____

3. (i) Is there a school professional development plan?

Yes ❑ No ❑

If yes, what is its focus this year?

_____

_____

(ii) Are trainee teachers included within the plan?

Yes ❑ No ❑

If yes, in what way?

_____

_____

4. (i) How well do you feel that trainee teachers are prepared for their practicums?

Very well ❑ Adequately ❑ Poorly ❑ Variably ❑

Why do you think that?

_____

_____

(ii) What changes do you suggest?

_____

_____

5. What are the special features of Normal and Model Schools which distinguish them from other providers of pre-service teaching? *Please comment on each of the following, in relation to your school:*

(a) Role in pre-service teacher education

(i) For the first 2 terms of 1997, please specify number of:

	Number
trainee teachers undergoing teaching practice	_____
trainee teachers undergoing micro-teaching	_____
trainee teachers undergoing demonstration teaching	_____
trainee teachers undergoing other practical experience	_____

(specify)

_____

_____

(ii) Any special roles of the teachers associated with the practicums:

time allocation

_____

_____

special training by Colleges of Education/training providers

_____

_____

liaison with Colleges of Education/training providers

_____

_____

training of associates

_____

_____

pastoral care for trainee teachers

_____

_____

briefing of trainee teachers by principal/senior staff

_____

_____

Other – *specify* _____

(b) Relationship with Colleges of Education or any other provider of teacher education:

(i) Are you consulted about curricula or programmes?

Yes ❑ No ❑

(ii) Do you get feedback from the practicums?

Yes ❑ No ❑

If yes, how do you use the information?

_____

_____

(ii) Do you or your staff give lectures at the college?

Yes ❑ No ❑

6. What are the special aspects of your school which arise from its designation as a normal/model school? *Please comment on:*

(i) Programmes:

_____

_____

(ii) Teachers:

_____

_____

(iii) Resources:

_____

_____

7. (i) What do you see as the most important goals of the teaching practicum? Please rate the following in order of importance 1-7 and add comments if necessary:

- ❑ pedagogy
- ❑ classroom management
- ❑ curriculum coverage
- ❑ communication with parents
- ❑ school governance
- ❑ assessment
- ❑ Teaching specific groups of students (Māori/other ethnic/special needs/gifted)

Comments:

_____

_____

(ii) What specific assistance do you provide for student teachers to reach these goals?

pedagogy

_____

_____

classroom management

_____

_____

curriculum coverage

communication with parents

school governance

assessment

teaching specific groups of students

(iii) Give details of any specific activities conducted by your school as part of the practicums in the first 2 terms of this year:

curricular

sport

cultural

social

_____

_____

other – *specify* _____

(iv) What feedback do you give students on their practicum?

oral

_____

_____

written

_____

_____

8. What evidence can you give of positive outcomes from your involvement in trainee teacher education? *Please comment on:*

(a) Trainee teacher satisfaction:

_____

_____

(b) College of Education/provider satisfaction:

_____

_____

(c) Any relevant material from your latest ERO report:

_____

_____

(d) The follow-on effect from involvement with the practicums for:

(i) Students

_____

_____

(ii) Teachers:

_____

_____

(iii) The school as a whole:

_____

_____

(e) Any other evidence:

_____

_____

9. (a) Do you see any advantages for your school arising from your designation as a normal/model school?

Yes ❑ No ❑

(b) *If yes,* give details

_____

_____

10. (a) are there any specific problems for your school arising from the provision of practicums?

Yes ❑ No ❑

(b) *If yes,* give details and describe what measures you have taken to solve the problem(s)

_____

_____

11. In relation to significant changes occurring in the teacher education environment, please comment on:

    (a) Recent developments in your area or region, e.g. new training providers, changes to pre-service teacher education curricula:

    _____

    _____

    (b) Future predictions, including anticipated demand for practicums for Terms 1 & 2 next year:

    _____

    _____

    (c) Any other changes:

    _____

    _____

12. What steps has your school taken to accommodate these changes?

    _____

    _____

13. Do you have any other comments on the value of contribution to pre-service teacher education by the normal and model schools?

    _____

    _____

Thank you very much for giving us your time.
Please mail back to NZCER by _____

APPENDIX 2

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR COLLEGE OF EDUCATION PRACTICUM CO-ORDINATORS

1. i) What do you see as the most important goals of the teaching practicum? Please rate the following in order of importance and add comments if necessary:

pedagogy

classroom management

curriculum coverage

communication with parents

school governance

assessment

teaching specific groups of students (Maori/other ethnic/special needs/gifted)

other - specify

ii) What specific assistance do you expect schools to provide for student teachers to reach these goals?

pedagogy:

classroom management:

curriculum coverage:

communication with parents:

school governance:

assessment:

teaching specific groups of students:

other

iii) What differences, if any, are there in the way that normal and model schools assist student teachers to reach these goals, compared with other schools who assist with pre-service teacher education in your region?

pedagogy:

classroom management:

curriculum coverage:

communication with parents:

school governance:

assessment:

teaching specific groups of students:

other:

2. Describe your relationship with the normal and model schools in your region and how it differs from that with other schools providing practicums? Please comment on:

a) Amount of contact - informal (eg school visits by lecturers):

- formal (eg membership of advisory committees)

b) Any specific funding that you provide to the schools to assist with the practicums

c) Other

3. What do you see as the main differences between the practicums provided by the normal and model schools, and those provided by other schools in your region. Please comment on:

a) facilities

b) curriculum content

c) specific activities

d) supervision

e) assessment of the student teachers

4. What do you think are the advantages of placing student teachers in practicums at the normal and model schools, compared with the others?

5. Are there any disadvantages? *Yes/No*
If yes, please specify

6. Do you have any other comments about normal and model schools?